

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. By the present amendment, claims 13-25 remain in the application while claims 13, 14, 24, and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-12 have been previously canceled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 is objected to for informalities. Appropriate correction has been performed per the examiner's suggestion. Thus, the objection as it applies to claim 14 is moot.

Claim 25 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form. Claim 25 has been amended as an independent claim. Thus, the objection as it applies to claim 25 is moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 13-17, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Elberbaum (US 7171106 B2). The rejection is respectfully traversed, although independent claims 13 and 24 have been amended to further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited reference.

Amended independent claims 13 and 24, in part, explicitly require "wherein the videos picked up by the plurality of imaging apparatus are processed so as to display a plurality of videos which are related with each other and satisfy the *related-video conditions*." Elberbaum merely teaches multiple cameras may be selected for split display (see col. 17, lines 4-10), but fails to teach that the multiple videos of the split display are related with each other and satisfy the *related-video conditions* as required in claims 13 and 24. In view of the differences between

the claimed subject matter and the cited reference, applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 and 24 are allowable, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 16, it requires “wherein an imaging apparatus for picking up the related video and an imaging apparatus for picking up the base video are different respectively.” Elberbaum discloses multiple cameras as input but does not explicitly teach that the based video and the related video are picked up by different cameras. Elberbaum does not exclude the possibility that the based video and the related videos are picked up by the same cameras, even though there are multiple cameras. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 22, it requires “wherein respective videos are ordered in response to a priority rule when the related video contains at least two videos.” Elberbaum is silent about the “priority rule” as required in claim 22. The passage that the examiner cited (col. 2, lines 42-44) against claim 22, merely teaches a memory for storing camera signals recorded during alarms, and is not related to the “priority rule”. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 15, and 17 depend from independent claim 1 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elberbaum in view of Monroe (US 6970183 B1). Claims 18-21 depend from independent claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Claims 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elberbaum.

It is noted that the examiner says the methodology in claims 23 and 25 provides no clear benefit over any other data retrieval scheme, and its inclusion in the system would be an arbitrary decision of the system designer. Applicant disagrees with the assertion. The benefits of the claim subject matter and the comparison with the other data retrieval scheme have been clearly explained in the specification (see pp. 65, line 22 through pp. 66, line 4). Thus, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 23 and 25 are respectfully requested.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-37326.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

Date: September 09, 2009

By: /michaelwgarvey/
Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700